



120

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CWP-12735-2026

Date of decision: 27.04.2026

Suresh Kumar

....Petitioner

Versus

Haryana Vidhyut Parasaran Nigam Limited and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Hardeep Singh Dhillon, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikrant Pamboo, Advocate
for the respondents-Nigam.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present civil writ petition has been filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of *mandamus* directing the respondents to consider the part time service of the petitioner as his qualifying service which has rendered by him on part time basis for a period of 13^{1/2} years prior to regularization of his services on 31.10.2003 for the purpose of computing his pensionary benefits and to release all the arrears of his pay with interest @ 12% per annum from 12.04.1990 to 31.10.2003.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner *inter alia* contends that the petitioner was initially appointed as a part time Sweeper in the erstwhile Haryana State Electricity Board on 12.04.1990 as discernible from Annexure P-1. The petitioner's service was regularized as regular officiating Sweeper w.e.f. 31.10.2003 as discernible from Annexure P-2. Further, more than 13 years of part time service of the petitioner has not been counted as qualifying service for



CWP-12735-2026

-2-

pensionary benefits despite repeated requests. He further submits that similarly situated employees, namely, Jai Bhagwan filed CWP No.1048 of 2016 titled as ***Jai Bhagwan Vs. State of Haryana and others*** which was allowed on 01.03.2019 and the judgment was further upheld by the Division Bench of this Court as well as by the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The case of the petitioner is squarely covered by the judgments rendered by this Court in ***Harbans Lal v. State of Punjab, CWP No.2371 of 2010*** and ***State of Haryana and others v. Jai Bhagwan, LPA No.1892 of 2019***.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he would be satisfied if the legal notice-cum-representation (Annexure P-3) of the petitioner is decided by respondent No.5 by passing a speaking order in a time bound manner.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondents-Nigam submits that he has no objection in case a direction is issued to respondent No.5 for time-bound consideration and decision of the legal notice-cum-representation of the petitioner by passing a speaking order.

5. Therefore, in view of the limited prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner, respondent No.5 is directed to consider the legal notice-cum-representation (Annexure P-3) of the petitioner in terms of the judgment rendered by the Division Bench of this Court in ***Jai Bhagwan's case (supra)*** and pass a speaking order, after affording them an opportunity to be heard, within a period of 03 months from the date of receiving a certified copy of this order. Further, the decision taken thereof shall be conveyed to the petitioner.

Needless to say, if the petitioner is found entitled to the relief sought, the same shall be granted forthwith by respondent No.5.

6. Disposed of, accordingly.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

27.04.2026
Neha

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No